

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejections of record in the June 30, 2005 *Office Action*.

Status of the Application

Claims 7-10 are all the claims pending in the Application. Claims 7-10 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner has rejected: (1) claims 7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Junji et al.* (US 2002/0070833; hereinafter “*Junjie*”) in view of *Hoang* (US 5,446,958; hereinafter “*Hoang*”); and (2) claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Junjie* in view of *Hoang* and *Kataja*. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 7, the Examiner alleges that *Junjie*’s: (1) cylinder 40; (2) bases 21, 22; and (3) pins 411-419 correspond to the recited: (1) “bobbin;” (2) “lower portion;” and (3) “plurality of pins.” However, the Examiner concedes that *Junjie* fails to teach or suggest the specific arrangement of the pins and circuit board (O.A., p. 2). Applicant agrees that *Junjie* is deficient in this regard.

Nevertheless, the Examiner alleges that *Hoang* discloses such features, in FIG. 9 thereof. Further, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention (“one of skill”) would have been motivated to “use pins/printed circuit board design of [*Hoang*] in [*Junjie*] for the purpose of facilitating mounting and reducing projected area” (O.A., p. 3).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's allegation that one of skill would have modified *Junjie* in view of *Hoang* to provide the features of the claimed invention, as alleged by the Examiner.

Specifically, *Junjie* is directed to a transformer bobbin 4 designed to be arranged in a **vertical** position with respect to a circuit board (see FIG. 3), in a manner generally similar to that shown in prior art FIGS. 1 and 2 of the instant Application.

In direct contrast, *Hoang* is directed to a transformer bobbin 1 arranged in a **horizontal** position with respect to a circuit board 9 (see FIG. 9), and is specifically directed to providing the configuration shown in FIG. 9 to **reduce** the height of the bobbin (col. 3, lines 17-22).

Accordingly, *Junjie* and *Hoang* are directed to two completely different arrangements of bobbins on a circuit board, and thus would not be viewed as being compatible by one of skill, at least as alleged by the Examiner. Further, the Examiner's alleged combination (*i.e.*, *Junjie*'s vertically arranged bobbin with *Hoang*'s terminals 3) would be directly contrary to the stated purpose of *Hoang*, as such a combination would necessarily result in a **thicker** bobbin / board combination than that shown in FIG. 9 of *Hoang*. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that one of skill would not have been motivated to modify *Hoang* as the Examiner alleges.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 7 is patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that rejected dependent claims 8-10 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/615,991

Attorney Docket # Q75619

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7-10 are allowable.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 7-10.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy P. Cremen
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 6, 2006